

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Action dated December 18, 2003. The claim amendments included herein are merely clarifying amendments and are not meant to change the intended scope of the claims. Thus, the amendments present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and they should be entered in due course. Moreover, the amendments are manifest, requiring only a cursory review by the Examiner, thereby providing additional ground for their entry.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 were pending in the application. In the Final Action, claims 1, 2 and 4-15 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 8-11 have been amended. Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,562) in view of Matthews, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837).

Applicants submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 4 and 8-11) are patentable over Shiga and Matthews.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward the transmission and reception of program data, data related to the program data and data concerning the display of the program related data. Each of the claims recites

that “the displaying of said program related information includes partitioning a display space according to a hierarchical structure having at least three levels, a main page level, a box level and a cell level, wherein main pages are linked to boxes via main-box link information and boxes are linked to cells via box-cell link information.” Each of the claims further recites that “each main page is associated with a main layout tag that includes an ID of a box composing the page and each box is associated with a box layout tag that includes an ID of a cell composing the box.” (emphasis supplied) Supporting disclosure for the layout-tag aspect of Applicants’ invention can be found in the specification at, for example, Figs 34A-34C; and page 26, line 20 – page 27, line 24.

Neither Shiga nor Matthews discloses displaying program related information by partitioning a display space according to a hierarchical structure having at least three levels, a main page level, a box level and a cell level, wherein each main page is associated with a main layout tag that includes an ID of a box composing the page and each box is associated with a box layout tag that includes an ID of a cell composing the box. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 1, 4 and 8-11 are patentable over Shiga and Matthews - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Claim 2 depends on claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claim 2 is believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of its dependency on claim 1.

Claims 5-7, 12 and 15 depend on claim 4. Since claim 4 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claims 5-7, 12 and 15 are believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of their dependency on claim 4.

Claim 13 depends on claim 9. Since claim 9 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claim 13 is believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of its dependency on claim 9.

Claim 14 depends on claim 11. Since claim 11 is believed to be patentable over the cited references, claim 14 is believed to be patentable over the cited references on the basis of its dependency on claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.


If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit
any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account
No. 50-0320.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Bruno Polito
Reg. No. 38,580